



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE DR.JUSTICE ANITA SUMANTH

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

HCP No. 2273 of 2025

Sandhiya

W/o.Ajith @ Munusamy,
No.9/330, Nethaji Street,
Lakshmi Nagar,
Pozhichalur,
Chennai District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State Of Tamilnadu Rep By, The Additional
Chief Secretary To Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner Of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police, (Goondas
Section),
Vepery,
Chennai-600 007.
3. The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal,
Chennai District.
4. The Inspector Of Police,
S-7, Madipakkam Police Station,
Chennai District.



..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Habeas corpus petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ, order or direction in the nature of a Habeas Corpus to call for the records relating to the detention order vide No.725/BBCDEFGISS/2025 dated 25.09.2025, passed by the Second Respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents herein to produce the petitioners Husband namely Ajith @ Munusamy, S/o.Thanikachalam, aged 26 years, (who is presently under going detention in the central prison, Puzhal, Chennai), before this Honble Court and set him at liberty.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.R.Parthiban

For Respondent(s): Mr.C.R.Malarvannan

Counsel For Government Of Tamil Nadu
(Criminal Side)

Order

(Order of the Court was made by Dr.Anita Sumanth J.)

We have heard Mr.R.Parthiban, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.C.R.Malarvannan, learned counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu (Criminal Side), learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The wife of one Ajith @ Munusamy (detenu) S/o Thanikachalam, who was detained as a Goonda under Section 2(f) of the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 (in short 'Act') has approached this Court challenging the order of detention dated 25.09.2025.




3. It is seen from the impugned order and the grounds of detention that the detenu was arrested on 03.08.2025 and he was detained on 25.09.2025. We do not find any satisfactory explanation for the delay in passing the order of detention either in the grounds of detention or in the counter affidavit filed by the 2nd respondent. Hence, we are of the view that the live and proximate link between grounds of detention and the purpose of detention stands snapped.

4. In *Sushanta Kumar Banik Vs. State of Tripura* (2022 LiveLaw (SC) 813), a similar issue arose, and the relevant discussion reads as follows:

“21. It is manifestly clear from a conspectus of the above decisions of this Court, that the underlying principle is that if there is unreasonable delay between the date of the order of detention & actual arrest of the detenu and in the same manner from the date of the proposal and passing of the order of detention, such delay unless satisfactorily explained throws a considerable doubt on the genuineness of the requisite subjective satisfaction of the detaining authority in passing the detention order and consequently render the detention order bad and invalid because the “live and proximate link” between the grounds of detention and the purpose of detention is snapped in arresting the detenu. A question whether the delay is unreasonable and stands unexplained depends on the facts and circumstances of each case.”

5. Drawing inspiration from the judgment in *Sushanta Kumar Banik's* case, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the case of *Gomathi Vs. Principal Secretary to Government and Others* (2023 SCC OnLine Mad 6332), had held



that when there is an inordinate delay between the date of arrest/date of proposal and the order of detention, the live and proximate link between them would also stand snapped and thereby, had quashed the detention order on this ground.

6. In yet another case i.e., in *Nagaraj Vs. State of Tamil Nadu*, ((2018) 3 MWN (Cri) 428), this Court had held that the delay of 36 days in passing the detention order after the arrest of the detenu would snap the live and proximate link between the grounds and purpose of detention. In the present case, the delay is more than a month, 32 days to be exact, and unexplained and for this reason, vitiates the order, rendering it liable to be quashed.

7. In light of the aforesaid discussion, we are of the considered view that there is neither a proximate link between the arrest (25.08.2025) and order of detention (25.09.2025), and nor is there any credible material brought on record by the detaining authority to substantiate his subjective satisfaction.

8. Hence, this Habeas Corpus Petition is allowed and the Detention Order passed by the second respondent in No.725/BBCDEFGISSSV/2025 dated 25.09.2025 is set aside.

9. The detenu, viz., Ajith @ Munusamy, S/o.Thanikachalam, male aged 26 years, who is now confined in Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai, is directed to



be set at liberty forthwith unless his presence is required in connection with any other case.

WEB COPY

(A.S.M.,J.) (S.M.,J.)

04-06-2026

sl

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Note to Registry: Issue Today.

To

1. The Additional Chief Secretary To Government,
Home, Prohibition and Excise Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner Of Police,
Greater Chennai,
Office of the Commissioner of Police, (Goondas Section),
Vepery,
Chennai-600 007.
3. The Superintendent Of Prison,
Central Prison,
Puzhal,
Chennai District.
4. The Inspector Of Police,
S-7, Madipakkam Police Station,
Chennai District.
5. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
6. The Joint Secretary to Government
Public (Law and Order),
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai – 9.



WEB COPY



DR.ANITA SUMANTH J.

AND

SUNDER MOHAN J.

SL

HCP No. 2273 of 2025

04-06-2026